

A
DEFENCE
OF
Dr. *Sherlock's* Preservative
AGAINST
POPERY,
IN
REPLY
TO A

Jesuit's ANSWER:

Wherein the R. Father's Reasonings
are fully Confuted.

By *William Giles* a Protestant Foot-man,
living with Madam *H.* in *Mark-Lane.*

The Fourth Edition.

London, Printed for *B. Aylmer*, at the Three Pigeons
over against the Royal Exchange in *Cornhil*, 1688.

Price Three Pence.

ELCA. C88G
FILES
138,089



22. 1952

ELCA. C88G
FILES
138,089

ELC

THE PUBLISHER TO THE READER.

I Have heard it often observed, that it would be a Work worth any ingenious Man's pains, and very acceptable to the World, to take a View of the whole Controversie betwixt the Writers of the Church of Rome and us since his Majesties coming to the Crown; and to compare it with the Management of this same Controversie at the beginning of the Reformation, and through the late Reigns, I am assured it would make such a Discovery of the present Controvertists of that Church, as would make all them to blush that have any Modesty, and the World to blush for them that have none.

It is very well known, that when the Reformation began, Learning was at a very Low Ebb, and they of the Church of Rome, who were commanded to defend it against the Reformers, had a very hard task of it; since they were engaged in matters wholly new to them; and, which was worse, in the Defence of a Cause which did want Arguments ten thousand times better than any could be gotten for it. However, to their Credit be it spoken, they undertook the matter fairly and were so just to their Adversaries, as well as to their own Cause, as to answer Book with Book, and not to drop their Weapon, and run away after the first little Charge.

But we have a quite contrary sort of Men to deal with now-a-days; they write us if the Controversie had but just begun, and as if they had not read so much as their own old Authors; but after one little Effort, fall to Sheet and Half sheet Replies, as if they that furnished them with the first Book, could not have furnished them also with a fair

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

9
 0
 k
 t
 A
 ij
 i
 I
 A
 G
 a
 a
 y
 as
 of
 fir
 R
 Cl
 un
 hu
 ib

 ex
 De
 PR
 cep
 sal
 gre
 Bod
 Rea
 tron
 been
 can
 rail
 selv
 inf
 wou
 ry d
 7

And this is that which hath made this present Controversie so very mischievous unto them; for some of their own Laity could not but own that the answering of large Books by Sheet, or Half-sheet, did not appear fair, but that it was very like it, if not a direct betraying of their Cause: And this was too apt to raise suspicions, either that their Priests could not defend their Cause, or that their Cause was such as was not to be defended. It were easie to give the Reader many Instances of this kind: When the Six Conferences concerning the Eucharist were published, a Book written with so much strength of Reason and Solidity, and which bore so very hard upon their great Doctrine of Transubstantiation, as to undertake to demonstrate that it did overthrow the Proofs of Christian Religion; we might have expected that the Romish Priests would have been justly alarm'd at such a Book of so threatening a nature to their Darling Transubstantiation, and would have employed the best Heads among them to answer so dangerous a Book; but as if they had all been asleep, the World is presented with a drowsie Half-sheet at last against a Book of about Eighteen Sheets; as if Tawning were to pass for Answering.

When that excellent Book, The Second Defence of the Exposition against the Bishop of Meaux and his Vindicator was Printed, and did so largely and so effectually prove all the former Charges against the wretched prevarications of that Bishop, and his Vindicator; Was it not a very pleasant thing to see a Sheet and half printed against it, with the pompous Title of A Full Answer to it? But I cannot be angry at the Man, for all the World is satisfied that he is sick of that Controversie; and that a Sheet and a Half was enough in Conscience for a Man in his Condition. He did indeed about the same time threaten the Learned Author of the Discourse against Extreme Unction with a Sheet against his Book, wherein he would take it to pieces: But I suppose he was half asleep when he made that promise, and quite

To the Reader.

quite forgot it upon his first sleep. It is ten to one, but some of their party will rouse up this doughty Champion, and tell him, that now he may venture to write his Sheet against that Book, since there is no fear of an Answer from the Author of that Discourse, who is now in his Grave: But if I might be of Council to him, I would advise him to think twice before he ventures on his Sheet-answer; for tho' the Incomparable and never-to-be-forgotten Dr. Clagett, the Author of that Book, be (to our unspeakable loss) in his Grave, yet neither his Book, nor his Memory, nor his Friends are buried with him; and though that Book is more than able to defend it self against so very weak an Adversary, yet were it not, I am told, that let our Adversaries begin as soon as they please, either against that, or any other of his many excellent Discourses against Popery; they will find, that there are too many Friends to the Memory and Reputation of that Pious and Learned Champion of the Church of England, to suffer any thing against Him to lye unanswered. And I cannot fancy but some People are my humble Servants for this kind hint, who do not love to burn their Fingers.

I will but mention one other instance of our Adversaries extravagant behaviour in this kind, against that Book, the Defence of which I am entrusted to publish, the Celebrated PRESERVATIVE AGAINST POPERY: how very acceptable to the World this excellent Tract was, the universal entertainment it met with, and the many thousands so greedily bought up, do sufficiently shew: How much the Book did in it self deserve all that kindness it found, every Reader will soon discover, that will but give himself the trouble to read any one Page of it. I must confess, I have been mightily pleas'd, that our Adversaries themselves can find how very good a Book it is: I hear some of them rail unmeasurably at it, and are at a loss how to vent themselves more passionately against it: and this I take for an infallible a sign, that this Book is a very good one, as I would the least commendation of theirs, for its being a very dull one.

This Book then, with the Commendation of all our own
A 3 *Church,*

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

P
 E
 G
 B
 n
 b
 r
 h
 m
 r
 c
 b
 r
 s
 G
 p
 i
 r
 k
 t
 v
 a
 l
 w
 a
 d
 d
 t
 t
 F

the
ke
the
ve
ab
le
wh
a F
de
don
she
tha
Fo

a
de
do
she
tha
Fo

To the Reader.

The Honest Footman does confine himself in his Reply to the Defence of the PRESERVATIVE it self, and lets the Jesuit's Preface alone, as nothing to the purpose indeed there: but I am willing to have a word or two with him about it, and see how the Reformers and those Men are concerned here in Answer to Dr. SHERLOCK's PRESERVATIVE.

The Jesuit at first dash accuses our Reformers of falling presently [when they set up for Opposers to Popery] to forgeries, clipping of Texts, Fathers and Councils; but forgets in his fury to give the Reader one instance of any Forgery, clipping of Text, Father, or Council. He should not have forgotten to have done this, since the World will be ready enough to believe that it was not for any good will that he did omit them, but that all the reason was, that tho he had malice enough to accuse them of it, yet that he wanted means to prove it upon them. But this Accusation they find to be absolutely necessary, because our Men do so often accuse them of those very things, and they are not for being behind-hand in such Charges, true or false it makes no matter, the thing must be done to keep off some way or other so severe a Blow. The Accusations run high on both sides, and the Reader hath this certain way of knowing where the Guilt lies, that the Church of Rome accuse us, but do not prove it, but our Men do not only accuse them, but prove it upon them.

For a clear Proof of this we need look no further than this Jesuit himself, who of all Men living should have kept his Pen from such an Accusation, since he knows one that lies under the severe charge of many such things. This very Jesuit is the Person so famous for the Controversie about a Sermon of St. Austins betwixt him and one of our learned Writers, who did not only prove that that Sermon which the Jesuit had quoted in a Prayer before Sermon was a Forgery, but that the Authors he brought afterwards to defend himself with, were neither better nor worse than down-right Forgeries. I have given my self the trouble for the worlds sake of examining that Controversie, and find that the 14th Sermon de Sanctis urged by the Jesuit is a Forgery; that the 18th of the same sort is a Forgery;

To the Reader.

* See the First and Second Letters to Lewis Sabran Jesuit.

that his St. Hieroms Sermon was a Forgery; that his Hephonfus was a Forgery; that his Mallion's Sermon was a Forgery; that his Story about Juvenal and Marcian the Emperor was a Forgery.

And in a Controversie betwixt these two, not above a Month ago, about Invocation of Saints, I find our Author charging the Jesuit with the same things, or worse, * that his first Author was supposititious; that he had not only clipt that Author's words, but brought them to prove that very thing, for the confuting of which

the Author had himself intended them: That he had put down a Prayer to the Virgin Mary, as out of that Author, not a syllable of which was to be found there; that the Jesuit had falsified his next Quotation from St. Cyril; that his Nectarius upon Theodore was a Forgery; that his Prayers to the Virgin Mary from Methodius, from Ephrem Syrus, from Athanasius, and from Leo were Forgeries; that Gregory Nazianzens Prayer to her was a Forgery; that his Proofs from S. Ambrose, from Gregory Nazianzens Iambicks were Forgeries; that his Proof from the Council of Chalcedon was clipt and abused; that his Quotations from the Council of Laodicea, Gangræ and Carthage were every one of them misrepresented and abused: I must confess I was amazed at such a mass of Forgeries in so little room, and could not have thought it possible that any man that pretends to the least knowledge in Books could be guilty of such things, much less that this very Jesuit could have been the Man, who is so very ready to accuse others (tho most falsely) of it.

He next falls upon particular Men, and begins with Dr. Comber, whose Book he says, was first set forth by him in the time of the pretended Plot, and is so full of false Quotations, that they can be produced by Dozens.

But these things should not have been asserted so boldly, for the Author of that Book printed it first in 1674. which is four years sooner than our Jesuit (who it seems knows better than he) will have it; and a third Edition of it

with

To the Reader.

with all the Quotations, was Licensed before the end of 1676. As for the Dozens of false Quotations which the Jesuit says are in that Book; let him produce them as soon as he pleases, I can assure him, he shall not fail of an Answer not only to them, but to those two his Friend the Representer hath already attackt.

As for the Answerer to the Address, whom the Jesuit next tells us was run down for an ignorant Scribler, I will only tell him, that the Addresser may very quickly hear from that worthy Person, who will convince them both, that we have no bad Cause to defend, and that he is no unskilful Defender of it.

And now the Jesuit has got to Dr. Sherlock's Preservative. where I shall take leave of him, and commit him to the Honnest Footman, who does here undertake him; but before I conclude this, I think it fit to give the Reader some account of the Defence of the Doctor's Book against the Jesuit, which I am here publishing.

It was brought to my hands by the young Man himself, who had been directed to me by a Friend. The reasons of his writing it, and encountering the Jesuit, I believe I have guessed before; and those that will peruse the Jesuit's Paper, will I question not be of my mind. He did with a great deal of Modesty, commit it to my Disposal: I told him I would Print it, since I was very well satisfyd with it. However, that the Reader may suspect no fraud nor foul play, I do profess here upon the word of a Christian, that I have committed it to the Press as it was deliver'd me by the young Man himself, in his own Hand-writing, without the addition, or taking away of one word, or altering one Sentence or Line, so that the Reader will have it just as I had; excepting the falseness of the English, which is pardonable enough in a poor Servant, that was very young deprived of his Parents, and never had more Learning than to read English: However, upon this, I order'd the Bookseller to speak to his Compositor at the Press, to correct the English as he sets it.

I hope none will be angry that I encourage so mean a Person so far, as to help his Book to the Press against the Jesuit, none of our Church will be angry, and none of theirs ought,

To the Reader.

Since they should remember, it is not so long since, that one of their Foot Soldiers was for fighting a Pen-duel with the Reverend and very worthy Dr. Tenison, (whom the Jesuit in this very paper could not avoid slandering) and published a thing called a Book against that worthy Person: the inequality between whom is, I take it, far greater than between my Writer and the Jesuit: and there is another greater difference in the business, for my Man treats the Jesuit throughout with respect, and gives him no ill Language: Had the other done so, it would, as I conceive, have been no disparagement either to his Cause, or his Profession.

And so I commit the Book to the Perusal of the Reader, whose favour I will not bespeak for it, since it is so able to speak for it self, and will only wish it good speed.

P O S T S C R I P T.

I Must not forget to advertise the Reader, that as to those Quotations out of Latin or Greek Authors, which the Young Man is far from understanding, as he declares in his Book, and therefore might justly be suspected to have been added by some other hand: (Upon my enquiry) He told me he had that from *Nicephorus*, out of the Preface of *White's Way to the Church*, and the rest from *Aliaco*, *Scotus*, and *Tonstal* out of the Book it self, *Digression 45th, numb. 9.* where I suppose any inquisitive Reader may find them.

Imprimatur,

A Defence of Dr. Sherlock's Preservative, &c.

May 2.
1688.

Guil. Needham.

A Defence of Dr. Sherlock's Preservative against Popery, in Reply to a Jesuit's Answer.

TO begin then with Dr. Sherlock's Principles, which overthrow all right use of common Sense: For the first, the Answerer tells us it is Page the Third, and there I find the Doctor blaming the Church of Rome 'for not suffering her People to Dispute their Religion, nor to read Heretical Books, nay not so much as to look into the Bible it self; which he repeats thus, *They will not allow reading Heretical Books*, leaving out what was said of the Bible, it being too hot for him; he could not deny the Fact, nor had courage enough to defend it, but saith, *His reason cannot teach him how God should require the Reading of Heretical Books*; and so takes it for granted, that all the Writings of our Divines are so, nay and the Bible it self too, if he will keep to the Doctors words. Well, but *there are some Ministers* (in the Moon possibly, for we cannot learn where) *that use all endeavours to hinder their Flock from hearing Catholick Sermons and reading Catholick Books*. Catholick Sermons, blessed be God, we do or may hear every Lords Day at least, yea and read Catholick Books too: Ah! but he means *Roman Catholick Books and Sermons*; let it be so, and desire him to tell you who it is that ever forbid his People to hear a Sermon, or read one of their Books; I confess this ought to be done with caution, knowing we have to do with them who make it their practice to deceive. For my part I gladly profess my self a Member, though an unworthy one, of the Church of England, and hope God will ever give me

Grace

Grace to do it : And I have, according to the liberty which God and that Church hath given me, read several Books, not refusing his Catholick ones, not being contented with an Implicit Faith, especially when I read in the Sacred Scripture a Command, *To be ready to give an Answer to every one that should ask a Question of the Hope which is in us, to try the Spirits, to try all things,* and the like ; and I know not but I may still do the same, as that small allowance of time, which one in my circumstances can expect, will afford me ; for as *Dionysius Alexandrinus* saith, (*Niceph. l. 6. c. 8.*) *He used sometimes to be occupied in reading the Writings and Treatises of Hereticks, though it something polluted his mind with touching their unclean Opinions, because he reaped this profit thereby, that he might the easier refell them, and the more execrate and detest them.*

Preservative against Popery, p. 4. 'Ask them whether they will allow you to judge for your selves in matters of Religion ; if they will not, why will they trouble you with disputing ? you cannot be convinc'd unless you judge too, and thereby resolve Faith into a private Spirit.-----Here let our Protestant fix his foot, and not stir an inch till they disown Infallibility, and confess, that every man can and must judge for himself, in matters of Religion, according to the proofs that are offer'd to him.

Answerer, this is to say, 'Tis impossible to convince a man that in reason he ought to submit his Judgment to that of any other, though Infallible. But how doth this Inference follow ? It appears plain and natural to me, that I may submit my Judgment to an Infallible Judge, and yet the Church of Rome may not be that Judge ; must I submit my Sense and Reason to be govern'd by the Pope, or else own it impossible to be convinc'd by Reason that I may do it to an Infallible Judge ? Upon my word, Sir, if you will but prove your Church Infallible, I'll immediately forsake that Church which at present I think my self very happy in, for yours. Doth this Pretty Logic, as you call it, make void all the right use of common Sense and Reason, when it should lead

lead us to submit to any just Authority? Surely no, but argues that we may make use of them to judge betwixt a just Authority, and an Imposture that usurps that name. The Doctor doth not take the *Jews part against St. Paul*, nor bid us not hearken to him till he disown Infallibility; 'tis the product of your own Brain: When you can give us such proofs for your Infallibility as he did, we shall own it; till then, we are content to be in the number of your Hereticks.

Preservative, fol. 6. *What difference is there between Mens using their private Judgments to turn Papist, or to turn Protestant? The Answerer tells us, page 4. That 'tis the same as betwixt two sick Men, the one whereof chooses to put himself in an able Doctors hands, whom he knows to have an infallible Remedy, whilst the other chooses his own Simples, and makes his own Medicine. Well, and is not here private Judgment used all this while? Doth not he that puts himself into this able Doctors hands, use his private Judgment as well as the other? And is not the Doctor as much obliged to him for it? for if he did not use his Judgment, how could he find out this able Doctor, or know that he had an Infallible Remedy? So that what Dr. Sherlock said is true, That you are as much obliged to private Judgment for your Converts as Protestants can be.*

Well, but now he tells us, the Doctor takes the Catholic's part, and though faintly, yet speaks well in so clear a Cause. (Preservative, fol. 9.) *The intention of these Disputes is only to lead you to the Infallible Church, and set you upon a Rock; and then it is very natural to renounce your own Judgment, when you have an infallible Guide. But now for convincing Reasons against this plain Truth, as he calls it; the first is, as he repeats it, thus, They cannot with any sense dispute with us about the particular Articles of Faith, because the sense given of Scripture and Fathers takes its Authority from the Church understanding it so. This he is pleased to say, is false; the sense takes its Authority from God who spake that Word. But how if that sense be not there? Yes, the Spirit*

Spirit of God is to abide with her (i.e. the Church of Rome) for ever, John 14. 16. and so she cannot err. I wonder how our Adversaries can so palpably wrest such Texts, especially considering they have so often been told of it by our Divines. But to return, the Doctor having said, 'That if we should admit of the former Plea, that then, first it puts an end to all the particular Disputes of Religion between us and the Church of Rome; we may dispute about an Infallible Judge, but they cannot with any sense dispute with us about the particular Articles of Faith, such as Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Worship of Images, and the like; for these are to be learnt only from the Church, and cannot be proved by Scripture or Fathers, without the Authority of the Church. But you see how he pares the words; and to shew you that this Charge is true, I shall only mention something upon the first Point, viz. Transubstantiation, out of their own Writers; and though I never read their Books, nor do understand any other Language than my own, yet I am so sure that they are honestly quoted, that I challenge any Romanist to prove the contrary. Petrus de Aliaco the Cardinal saith, (4 V. 6 Art, 2 f.) That manner which supposeth the Substance of Bread to remain still is possible, neither is it contrary to reason, or to the Authority of Scripture; nay it is easier to conceive, and more reasonable than that which says the Substance doth leave the Accidents; and of this Opinion no inconvenience doth seem to ensue, if it could be accorded with the Churches determination. Scotus saith (Script. Oxon. 4. D. 11. q. 3. § quantum ergo ad istum) Principally this seemeth to move us to hold Transubstantiation, because concerning the Sacraments we are to hold as the Church of Rome doth. And (4 d. 14 q. 3. Bill. Euchar. l. 3. c. 23. There is no Scripture to convince it, unless you bring the Church of Rome's Exposition. Tonsal saith, (de Verit. Corp. & Sang. p. 46.) That it was free for all men, till the Council of Lateran, to follow their own conjectures as concerning the manner of the Presence.

This shews upon what account Popery is believ'd, and with what respect they treat Scripture, making it indeed

deed what they have called it, *A Nose of Wax*, that so it might be flexible to cover their Errors. Now if the Sense they contend for cannot be proved from those Texts which they bring for it, nor is contained in Scripture, but that another Sense may be had without any inconveniency, that is more easie to conceive, and more reasonable, but that the Church of Rome hath determined otherwise: Surely we may conclude, that the Scripture takes its Authority from the Church, understanding it so, seeing they believe it wholly upon that account, and would believe otherwise, were it not for that Reason.

Preservative, &c. fol. 11. *Ask them whether the belief of an Infallible Judge must be resolved into every man's private Judgment? Whether it be not necessary to believe this with a Divine Faith? And whether there can be a Divine Faith without an Infallible Judge? (Answerer, p. 4.) There can be no Divine Faith without a Divine Revelation. True; and therefore if you will have me with a Divine Faith, believe that there is an Infallible Visible Judge, nay, that the Pope is he, pray shew me a Divine Revelation for it.*

Answerer, p. 5.) *No understanding Protestant can be disputed into Popery, which owns an Infallible Church, &c. But the Doctors words are, 'No understanding Protestant can be disputed into this kind of Popery, [i. e. that the Church is infallible, and that the Church of Rome is that infallible Church;] and then gives his reasons: '1. No Arguments can give me an infallible certainty of the Infallibility of the Church (f. 17.) Now what saith the Answerer? why hear him, We saw Dr. Sherlock just now pleading for the Jews against St. Paul, now he reasons even against Christ our God blessed for evermore, (just alike indeed Sir) his words prove that Christ who own'd himself Infallible, did imprudently to Preach or work Miracles. — Arguments so offensive to pious Ears (mentioned 2 Tim. 4. 3.) ought to meet with no other Answer than Prayers for him who offers them.*

6 *A Defence of Dr. S's. Preservative*

them. And doth this indeed follow from the Doctors words? Is the comparison all one between your Reasons and Arguments for your Churches Infallibility, and those which Christ offer'd with the addition of Miracles? And yet though he was Infallible, and did work Miracles to confirm his Doctrin, he did not command them to be content with an Implicit Faith, but the contrary, *Search the Scriptures*, John 5. & 39. and Mark 12. 24. tells them, *They erred not knowing the Scriptures*. Besides, Sir, could there not be a true certainty without Infallibility? Doth Dr. Sherlock say, *That the Jews could not be disputed into Faith, unless that Faith were Infallible*? No, he leaves that to be talked of by you who are the great Pretenders to it.

Ibid. *'It is impossible by reason to prove, that men must not use their own Reason and Judgment in matters of Religion.* Answerer, *That Men must use Reason to come to the Knowledge that God hath revealed what they believe is very certain——* But after that there is no further use of Reason, if we believe St. Paul, but in order to the bringing into Captivity all Understanding into the Obedience of Christ, 2 Cor. 10. his meaning is, that he will allow you to use your Reason, so long as it leads you to the Church of Rome; but if once you find any thing to contradict that, you must immediately renounce it, and not expect Sense and Reason from an Infallible Church, which is above all that; but methinks if my Sense and Reason will serve me to find out an Infallible Church, it is a little severe to renounce it when I come there. We do not find in Scripture that they did or were required to do thus, nay the contrary; and yet sure the Apostles were as Infallible as the Church can pretend to be now, 1 Epistle of John 4. 1. *Believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits whether they be of God.* 1 Cor. 10. 15. *I speak as to Wise Men, judge ye what I say.* And Acts 17. 11. *We have this particular commendation of the Bereans, that they were more noble than those of Thessalonica, in that they received the Word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, to see whether*

whether what they heard were conformable thereto, or no.

Preservative, &c. fol. 21. ' We have as much assurance of every Article of our Faith, as you have of the Infallibility of your Church; first, because we are in general assured that the Scriptures are the Word of God. Answerer, Hitherto there holds some parity, though but lame, but suppose it were intire, the Conclusion would be this, Catholicks are as certain of the Sense of Scripture, as Protestants are that they have the Letter. But don't you forget, Sir, that Infallibility is the Point disputed? you say indeed you have it, but you are Judges in your own Cause; none own it but your selves; but the Scripture all Christians own to be the word of God, yea and we have the concurrent Testimonies of all Churches that we have those Canonical Books: And have we no better ground for our Belief in that point, than you have for the other, seeing you contradict and dispute against all Mankind, and are fain to take it upon your own Word, with the wresting of a Text or two to speak for the Church of Rome, which is to have no other Limitation than to the Church Universal; but if your Church be not Infallible (which you know we say) what warrant can you have for receiving particular points of Faith, wholly because she teacheth them? Here if you are not sound in the first point, all the rest will tumble. But now Protestants have all the certainty imaginable for the Rule of their Faith, and for the particular points of it; because they prove them from the Word of God, which is their Rule. But let us suppose a while that your Church were Infallible, what greater Certainty (for that is the Point you know which the Doctor was upon) have you of it, than we have of any particular point of Faith? As for the certainty of Reason and Argument, that we have, and would fain see you shew more; what we believe is according to Scripture, and doth not contradict either Sense or Reason, nor any other Principle of Knowledge; which you know the People of your Church are not to stand upon; but submit to her teaching, let her teach how she will, because she is supposed to be Infallible, though they have

no

8 *A Defence of Dr. S's. Preservative*

no greater certainty of it, than Protestants have for any single point; which makes it ridiculous indeed, for any Man to forsake the Church of England for the Church of Rome, upon the account of greater certainty.

Preservative, *Ibid.* Secondly, 'and in particular, we are assured that the Faith which we profess is agreeable to Scripture. Thus far the Answerer: But the Doctor added, 'or expressly contained in it, and does not contradict either Sense or Reason, nor any other Principle of Knowledge. Now what saith the Answerer? why, If he means that they have the same Proof for this, which Catholicks have for the Infallibility of the Church, that is, for the Being of that Church which declares her self Infallible (for a Church erring in such a point, would cease to be the Church of Christ) then 'tis evidently false, since each Christian in this Age hath the same Evidence of her being the Church of Christ, and of her teaching Truth, and consequently of her Infallibility, which he hath of Christ, viz. Prophecies, Miracles, &c. which no Protestant so much as challengeth for the certainty of the particular Sense of Scripture; the same Proofs which Catholicks have for the Infallibility of the Church, that is, for the Being of the Church. This is a pretty conceit, the Infallibility of the Church, that is to say, the Being of the Church: Can't a Church be then without being Infallible? Well! but every Christian in this Age hath the same Evidence of the Church of Rome being the Church of Christ, and of her teaching Truth, and consequently of her Infallibility, which he hath of Christ, viz. Prophecies, Miracles, &c. And where I pray are these things? What! the Evidence so plain to all Christians, and yet two parts of three that can see no such thing? I confess we have heard much of Miracles, but could never see any; if they have any, they are kept to themselves: but 'tis no matter, for (as a late Author hath it) the greatest Miracle is, that any man can believe them: I shall not repeat any; they are common enough; any one that hath a mind to a whole Book full, need but enquire for the School of the Eucharist, and I believe he will have satisfaction.

Pre-

Preservative, &c. f. 23. 'If you must not use your Reason and private Judgment, then you must not by any Reasons be persuaded to condemn the use of Reason. This is a plain case; for as the Doctor adds, 'to condemn is an act of Judgment: But the Answerer saith, All this might with equal weight be said of a sick Man, who dissuaded from choosing his own Remedies, and desired to send for a skilful Doctor, should answer, 'Tis impossible by Reason to persuade me not to use my Reason, in governing my self by Reason, as my own Reason teacheth me; which would be to condemn Reason, and yet be guided by your Reason; such Discourse would prove the Sick Man at least somewhat light headed. What 'tis a Symptom of in Dr. Sherlock his Modesty will not let him be positive in. But, Sir, Is this same Sick Man, when he is desired to send for some able Doctor, persuaded to renounce his Reason, or rather, is it not that he should submit his Judgment (not renounce his Reason) in that case, to that Person whom he hath all the reason in the World to believe, hath better knowledge and understanding of those things which are to be us'd for his Recovery than himself? And all this while, methinks he is govern'd by Reason, though he doth not think fit to trust his own skill; 'tis the Doctor's Profession to know what Medicines are fit to be used in such and such Cases and Constitutions, which I never trouble my self about; and therefore surely I may be govern'd by him, without renouncing my reason, nay, 'tis Reason that makes me do it. But this bears no comparison; Religion is, or ought to be the concern of all; Physical Speculations, of those only who are pleased to make it their Study: Every one must believe for himself, but every one is not obliged to be his own Doctor.

Preservative, &c. fol. 25. 'We must allow of no Reason against the Authority of plain and express Scripture—— We may reasonably conclude, that God understands the reasons and nature of things better than we. This the Answerer saith, is a very true and Catholick Principle. Whence we may infer, That when the Doctor comes to apply it, that
he

he will be guilty of some Illogical Inference. Alas for Dr. Sherlock! who can hold no Catholick Principle, but what must have some Illogical Inference attending it to spoil all; but lets hear it: 'Thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve, is such a plain and express Scripture, that no reason can justify the Worship of another Being. And what saith the Answerer to this, sure some great matter, since he prepared his Reader before-hand with a Behold? Why 'tis like this, A Subject must love his King, and owe Allegiance to him alone; therefore no reason can justify the love of a Child for his Father, or a Wife for her Husband. What a delicate piece of Sophistry is here! But 'tis no matter, his design is to confound us unlearned Hereticks: But, Sir, the Command is, to serve God only; which Service, we must of necessity understand to be that which is Divine; but Worship is so: wherefore it irresistably follows, that we must not worship any other Being, but what we are here commanded to serve, which is, God alone: So your similitude will not hold. I am to love my King, (and I thank God I do it heartily) and to owe all Allegiance to him, but I may love another to whom I owe no Allegiance; but to worship a Being, I can't without serving that Being; wherefore the Text is plain against the Worship of any other but God.

Preservative, &c. fol. 26. and in the Answer, p. 6
 'The sense of the Law is the Law — but when the Law is not capable of a different sense, or there is no such Reason as makes one sense absurd, and the other necessary, the Law must be expounded according to the most plain and obvious sense of the Words. Answerer. This Principle is sound. You may then be sure of a false Inference at the heel of it; just as before. Surely this Gentleman is one of Momus's Race, whom nothing could please. They write of him, that none of the Gods could do any thing but he had a quarrel at it; when Neptune had made a Bull, Vulcan a Man, and Minerva a House, he quarrell'd at the Bull because the Horns stood on his Head; the Man, because he had not a Window in his Breast; the House, be-
 cause

cause it stood not upon Wheels, to remove it when it stood not well; and when *Venus* walked by, smiling at his conceit, he told her, she was not well made neither; and her shooes made too much creaking as she went. But for the Doctors false Inference; and this it is, 'Thou shalt not make to thy self any Graven Image, &c. which is so express a Law against Image-worship, that no Reason must be admitted for it: And what hath he to say to this? Why, there are two Questions which he thinks cannot be Answer'd, but that the Doctor's false Inference will appear: First then, *What if you be told, that although the Jews had perhaps a Command of making no Graven Image, &c. yet this being a positive Law, and not confirmed in the Gospel, doth not oblige us? Will this reason be admitted? No; and yet you have no other motive to pass by as express a Law of Sanctifying Saturday. And do you indeed Sir, think it all one? Is it not held on all hands that the keeping of the Seventh Day was Figurative, and so abolish'd at the Death of Christ? But so far as it was Moral, namely, that a Seventh day should be kept, that still remains. Besides, were we, or Christ and his Apostles, Authors of this change? Christ as he rose on that day, so he did usually appear on that day to his Disciples: And doth not the Scripture maintain the Celebration of it by the constant practice of the Apostles, Acts 20. & 7. 1 Cor. 16. & 21. which shews, that we have better foundation for our Belief in this point, than you who rely on Tradition. Well! But suppose it be rejoin'd, that only the making to themselves (by private Authority) an Idol to Adore it with Divine Worship is forbidden, can none of these Reasons be heard? no; then Bezaleel by Gods Command, making several likenesses of things on Earth, Solomon placing such in the Temple, sinned against the First Commandment — The Truth is, what sense they put on any Text, is the express Law, against which, no Reason must be heard; so they challenge to themselves the Infallibility which they so sturdily deny to the Church of God. For answer to this then, first, we do not challenge the Infallibility which the polluted and degenerate Church of*

of Rome (which he calls the Church of God) claims : For she would have us take the sense of any Scripture upon her own word ; and because she so teacheth, we must submit to her definitions ; and for this reason, because she hath defined them : 'Tis not for private Christians to examin particular points of their Faith or Religion ; no, 'tis sufficient to submit to an Infallible Guide ; and that too, if she declares as the Council of Constance did, *Session 13. concerning the Eucharist, That notwithstanding our Lord did institute it in both kinds, and the Apostles so celebrated it, yet now it should not be so ;* which was confirmed by the Council of Trent, *Seff. 21.* But for us Protestants, we cannot think that any reason can be sufficient to lay aside an express Text. Well, but how shall we excuse Bezeleel and Solomon from sinning against the First Commandment ? Why truly that is very easie ; for 'tis plain, that they did not make them for any Religious Worship, neither did they pay any Adoration to them. And what comparison this hath to the Practice of the Church of Rome at this day, I shall leave to any Man who hath any knowledge of their Religion, to judge.

And now (in good time) he tells us he will conclude the Doctor's admirable Principles and Inferences [i. e. that make void all right use of common Sense and Reason] with one so singular, that it deserves to be observed by all : And truly it doth so, but 'tis of his own coining ; take it in his own words, page 6. *No Argument from the necessity of a thing must be admitted to prove it is ; if there be no Infallible Judge, there can be no certainty of Faith—Tho it be true, and you think it to be true, you must not allow this consequence, therefore there is one.----- Such Arguments do not prove that there is such a Judge, but that there ought to be.* Now to see the Disingenuity (to say no worse) of this Author, we must look into the Doctor's Book, and there (f.44.) he tells us, That 'we should never admit any Arguments meerly from the usefulness, 'conveniency, or supposed necessity of any thing to prove it is. Now the Answerer leaves out the word *supposed*, and so makes

makes that absolute, which was only conditional, f. 45.
 'If there be not an infallible Judge, there can be no certainty
 'in Religion: This the Doctor said; but for whom, I
 pray, for himself, or for the Roman Catholick? And
 therefore he goes on, 'If I thought all this were true (as
 'I believe not a word of it is) I should only conclude, that
 'it is great pity that there is not an infallible Judge in-
 'stituted by Christ: But if you would have me con-
 'clude from these promises, *ergo*, there is an infallible
 'Judge of Controversies, I must beg your pardon for
 'that; for such Arguments as these do not prove that
 'there is such a Judge, but only that there ought to be
 'one, and therefore I must conclude no more from them.
 'Indeed this is a very fallacious way of reasoning, be-
 'cause what we may call useful, convenient, or necessary,
 'may not be so in it self; and we have reason to believe
 'it is not so, if God have not appointed what we think
 'so useful, convenient, and necessary, which is a truer and
 'more modest way of reasoning, than to conclude, that
 'God has appointed such a Judge, when no such thing
 'appears, only because we think it so useful and necessary,
 'that he ought to do it. And now I would fain know
 who it is that denies Wisdom and Reason in God.

And thus I have run through that point, which the
 Answerer told us he would enlarge upon, *i. e.* Reason,
 which to defend Protestancy, we must make void, for
 so fam'd an Author as Dr. Sherlock, could not support
 it, he saith, *without making void all Reason*, which Charge,
 how well he hath proved, the Reader is to judge.

To go on then, the Principles of Dr. Sherlock, which
 make void all Faith, follow next, which if I can but
 find, we are to take notice of: And I shall not say any
 thing to that long Harangue, which the Answerer makes,
 before he tells us where they be; not that I think it un-
 answerable, but because it is that which hath been so
 often answered by our Divines, and what they can say
 nothing to, but repeat over there old Objections again,
 that so, if possible, they might keep those Learned Men
 from better employment. For the first then, the An-
 swerer tells us it is fol. 78. mistaken for fol. 79. & 80.
 where

where the Doctor puts the case thus: 'Suppose the Protestant Faith uncertain, how is the Cause of the Church of Rome ever the better? Is Thomas an honest Man, because John is a Knave? To this he answers, That if Thomas and John be accused severally of Theft, and the stoln Goods be found with John, I conceive, though this prove not Thomas so assuredly an honest Man, yet an honest Jury would, he conceives, bring him in not Guilty. That there is a true Faith, and consequently a certain Rule of Faith all Christians acknowledge; Protestants on one side choose one Rule, (how differently ever they apply it) Catholicks another; I conceive then if the Protestant Rule be proved uncertain, 'tis plain the Catholicks Rule must be the certain one. But for answer to this conceit, which I confess made me smile at the reading; and to begin with John and Thomas for the first, The stoln Goods are found with him, and so he's condemned; but now for the proof that Thomas is an honest Man, and I see no necessity that he should be so, unless there was nothing for him to steal but what John had got; nay, unless it be also proved that he had no hand in the taking of those Goods which were found with John, which he might have, and so be equally guilty with him, notwithstanding their being found with another. And so for Protestants and Roman Catholicks, one choose one Rule and the other another. And suppose the Protestant Rule be proved false, doth it indeed necessarily follow that the Catholicks must be true? I conceive, Sir, that you must first prove that it is impossible for People to make to themselves two wrong Rules, which I presume will be labour. Suppose I should tell you, that there were two Men which were to go to such a City or Town, but could not agree in their Judgments concerning the nearest way which lead to it, and so took two several ways, and conclude, when one of them had been prov'd to err, that the way which the other took must be the nearest way, which was to go to that City or Town, and so the true and right way: Would you not answer me, That that did not follow, for there might be a third, and so a nearer than either of the former, and that they

they might both err; wherefore if you could prove the Protestant Rule uncertain, I do not see how it appears so plain, as you would persuade me, that your Catholick one is the right.

What can be the Gentleman's meaning in his next affected Paragraph, I cannot conceive, unless it be this, *That because Protestants take the Reasons of their Faith from Scripture, and not from the Church of Rome, that therefore they can have no certain or Divine Faith, which if it be, I pity him; if it be not, I must desire him to explain himself.*

Preservative, &c. *ibid.* 'We believe the Apostles Creed, and whatever is contained in the Writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, and this is all we believe: And, I hope, they will not say that these things are uncertain. Answer, p. 7. *They are in themselves very certain, but not to any Protestant, whose Rule of Faith cannot make him certain of any one Article.* This is pleasant, these things are certain, but the Scripture, which is our Rule, cannot make us certain of any one Article contained in it; which shews demonstratively upon what account they hold their Religion, and believe the Articles of their Faith, not because they find them in Scripture, for that cannot make them certain they are there, but because their Church so teacheth, which is the thing he means; that God hath given sufficient means to come to the knowledge of, if we would but use them: Well, but the Doctor's Answer justifies Turk, Jew, and Gentile, and how, I pray, do they believe all that is contain'd in the Writings of the Evangelists and Apostles which we do? and which you cannot deny, but with a little grumbling, because we will not receive it upon the Authority of your Church, with those additions which she is graciously pleas'd to make.

Preservative, &c. f. 81. 'If these things, [i.e. the Writings of the Apostles, &c.] be not built upon certain Reasons, their Infallible Church can have no certainty of the Christian Faith. Answerer, *This is most notoriously false, since she is not infallible by any Light of her own, but by the Guidance of*

the Spirit of Truth. Were not the Apostles certain of what Christ told them, when they had acknowledg'd him the Son of God, before he gave them certain Reasons for it? 'tis a blind Impiety even to think so. Patience good Sir, and only be pleased to tell me whether theirs was a certain Faith without certain Reason or no? As for what the Doctor said, it is undoubtedly true; for as he saith but just before, 'Infallibility cannot make that certain, which is in it self uncertain: an Infallible Man must know things as they are, or else he is mistaken, and ceases to be Infallible; and therefore what is certain, he infallibly knows to be certain; and what is uncertain, he infallibly knows to be uncertain; for the most certain and infallible knowledge does not change its Object, but sees it just as it is. Wherefore supposing your Church had the guidance of the Spirit of Truth to make her infallible in all things, she must certainly see things as they are: Wherefore the Scripture must be the Word of God, and what is contained therein certain, because she so teacheth, or else she ceaseth to be Infallible.

Preservative, (Gc. fol. 82.) 'Tis their common Argument, that there is a great variety of Opinions among Protestants, and that they condemn one another with equal confidence and assurance. But the Answerer saith, he should have added, *Though they use the same Rule of Faith, and apply it by the same means, and that thus propos'd 'tis an unanswerable Argument against our Rule of Faith, and evidently proves it uncertain.* Alas for us now, we are gone with a witness, our Rule being prov'd uncertain, we must certainly err if we rely upon it: yet chear up, we have heard this unanswerable Argument answer'd, particularly by the Reverend Dr. *Stillingsfleet*, in his Answer to *J. S's* Catholick Letters; but 'tis a Talent inherent in a *Romanist*, to repeat his old musty Arguments, without taking notice of what hath been said in Answer thereto. But I must beg leave a while to look into the fore-named Book, and there I find a full Answer to what is here said; *J. S.* having said, *That Scripture interpreted by private Judgment was not the way*

to know certainly what Christ and his Apostles taught, because they that made use of it that way did not agree, but differ'd in Fundamentals. (In his first Letter.) The Doctor answers, fol. 39. thus, it doth not follow, by no means, that the Scripture is no certain Rule; and he puts it thus, according to J. S's Propositions, 1. 'Arithmetick prescribes a certain way by Addition and Substraction for us to find out any Sum. 2ly. Therefore it must be such, that that they who take it shall arrive by it at the just Sum. 3. 'But two men who have made use of the same way, differ at least a hundred in casting up the Sum. 4ly. Therefore Arithmetick doth not prescribe a certain way to attain at a certain Sum. 5ly. Therefore they who take only that way, cannot by it arrive at the certain Sum. But, saith he, f. 40. 'those who consider a little better than Mr. Shath done, will distinguish between the Rule and the Application of it; the Rule of Arithmetick may be nevertheless certain, altho those who want care and diligence, may mistake in casting up a particular accompt. 'The same we say here, Scripture is a certain Rule in all Fundamental Points, to such as have capacity, and use due care and diligence in finding them; but we do not deny that men through prejudice, weakness, want of attention, authority of false Teachers, impatience of thoroughly examining things, and not using proper helps, may run into gross Errors — But still the Rule is certain to those who use it aright, f. 41. For altho the Scripture be an infallible rule, yet unless every man that makes use of it be infallible, he may mistake in the application of it. I desire the Gentleman to take this into consideration, and if he think it not sufficient, to try his skill upon Dr. Stillingfleet.

Preservative, &c. f. 83. 'Were all Protestants of a mind, would their consent and agreement prove the certainty of the Protestant Faith? The Answerer saith, Not at all, yet that it is a most ridiculous Inference of Dr. Sherlock, that this is the same Rule, and their Disagreement proves not their Uncertainty. All Union is no Argument of the Spirit of God; for People may combine to do ill; yet St. Paul assures us, Disunion and Dissention is a certain mark of the

absence of the Spirit of God. You should have added, in some, not in all the disagreeing Parties: For suppose, Sir, the Question be put among a Company of Men to go rob such a House, or kill such a Man; some of them consent to it, but there are others which will not; I desire to know, whether it be a mark of the absence of the Spirit of God in those which do not agree to do that Wickedness? And so you see what the Doctor's most ridiculous Inference comes to, and how he hath made void all Faith.

But now for Dr. Sherlock's Position, which makes void all Scripture-proof, as it lies in the Answer, p. 7. If a Mystery appear against Sense and Reason, we must have a Scripture-proof as cannot possibly signify any thing else, or else it will not answer that Evidence which we have against it, Sense and Reason proving it naturally impossible. A Text, he saith, which cannot possibly have another Sense, doth not leave it in any ones Liberty, who owns Scripture, to be an Heretick; therefore the Church produced no such Text against the Arians and Nestorians; whence it evidently follows, that according to Dr. Sherlock, the Arians and Nestorians were bound not to believe the Trinity, and the Incarnation of Christ, A Happy Ministerial Guide! And well lead those that follow him! And now, Reader, I must desire you again to look into the Doctor's Book, and read what he saith, where I find that 'tis but 'reasonable' that the Evidence for it (i.e. Transubstantiation) should at least be equal to the Evidence against it, f. 70. And therefore we must demand a self-evident Proof for this, because 'tis self-evident that Transubstantiation contradicts Sense and Reason, fol. 71. And so he saith, fol. 72. That we must demand such a Scripture-proof of Transubstantiation as cannot possibly signify any thing else, [without contradicting Sense and Reason as that doth] 'or else it will not answer the evidence we have against Transubstantiation; for Sense and Reason pronounce Transubstantiation to be naturally impossible; and therefore, unless it be as impossible to put any other Sense upon Scripture, than what signifies Transubstantiation, as it is to reconcile Transubstantiation to Sense

and

and Reason, there is not such good Evidence for Transubstantiation as against it. With what Conscience now can any man cavil at this, and say, that it makes void all Scripture-proof? As for the Trinity and Incarnation, which the Arians and Nestorians disputed, they are Mysteries indeed, and might seem to be above Sense and Reason, but they are not contrary to it; and it was not necessary to produce Scripture, which could not possibly signify any thing else, that is to say, which could not possibly have any other Sense put upon them, without contradicting Sense and Reason; for they could not prove that those which were disputed did either. But now for Transubstantiation, that that doth both, is plain; wherefore 'tis but reasonable to desire a Scripture-proof that cannot signify any thing else but Transubstantiation, without contradicting Sense and Reason, else, as the Doctor saith, *there is not so good Evidence for it as against it*; so that for ought our Author can say, Dr. Sherlock is a good Ministerial Guide, and those may be happy which follow his Guidance; when those who seek to pervert Souls, and bring them into a By-way of Darkness and error, may be lamenting abus'd Mercy, and that they made no better use of that Talent which God had lent them.

Next comes the Doctor's Position, *making void all use of Holy Fathers and General Councils*, which to prove, the Answerer repeats by halves what the Doctor said, and then concludes, *That some of these Requisites not being possibly to be known, no use is to be made of any*. What Dr. Sherlock said is this, *That 'twas ridiculous for that man that hath been taught his Religion out of the Scripture, and which he might find there if he pleas'd, to change it for Quotations out of the Fathers and Councils which he did not understand, because some honest Priest (a sort of men which never deceive any one) had told him that such a Father, who liv'd it may be they know not where nor when, and wrote they know not what, has spoke in favour of Transubstantiation, or Purgatory, or some other Popish Doctrine*. And then he comes to tell us what Questions we ought to ask, when we are urged with the Authority of Fathers, as,

How

* *How we shall know that such Books were written by that*
 * *Father whose Name it bears ? Whether it be uncorrupted ?*
 * *How we shall know the true meaning of those words they cite*
 * *from them, which the words themselves many times will not*
 * *discover without the Context, and the like, which requirits*
 that Man who will build any thing upon their Authority, must know, or else he may be miserably mistaken; yet this is not to deny any use of Fathers and Councils; for Learned Men may dispute about them as they please; and I question not, if our Religion were to be try'd by the Fathers, but that we should undoubtedly carry it against the Church of Rome, notwithstanding all her pretences to Antiquity; and yet we do not build our Faith thereon, but keep to that Rule which they had to walk by, which is the Word of God, contained in the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament.

And now I am arriv'd to the last Point, which our candid Answerer undertook, *viz.* to shew that Dr. Sherlock made void all moral *Honesty*, and that he tells us lies in his last Chapter, where to insinuate, that a *Catholick* thinks the Blessed Virgin more powerful in Heaven than Christ, he tells us, that he says ten Ave Marias for one Pater-Noster. Well! for the matter of Fact, that the Catholick doth say Ten Prayers to the Virgin for One to Christ, the Answerer can't deny. Ay, but he doth not think her more powerful than Christ. Suppose that; yet sure he must think her more merciful, and readier to hear his Prayers than Christ, or else why is he so partial to pay Ten for one? which I doubt will prove much of a consequence with the former: And yet if the Doctor had not only done what he here persuades us he doth, but directly said it, I know not how he would have excused some of his own Party: And you know, Sir, what the Author of the *Remarks upon the Reflections of the Author of Popery Misrepresented and Represented* hath undertaken, *viz.* this among many other things, to shew, when you shall desire it, that there are some of your own Writers, who believe the Blessed Virgin to have as much Power in Heaven as her Son; and that maintain the praying to her

to command him, and begging from her pardon of Sins, and the assurance of Salvation. To conclude, the Answerer tells us, that to be thorough-Sherlock, and thorough-Protestant-Minister, he concludes with the most disingenuous misrepresentation, and the most false Calumny imaginable, as a supposed and owned Truth, to wit, That Catholicks worship the visible Species in the Eucharist: A most impudent Slander, he saith, no Catholick being guilty of it, no more than the Apostles of worshiping and adoring the Cloaths of Christ, when they ador'd him upon Earth. Preservative, fol. 89. 'He (Papist Represented) believes it unlawful to commit Idolatry, and most damnable to worship any Breaden God, which, saith Dr. Sherlock, is spoke like a Protestant, but yet he pays Divine Adoration to the Sacrament, which is done like a Papist. Here you see is no mention made of Species, but the word is Sacrament; and that they do pay Divine Adoration to that, they can't deny; but then they tell us, That Christ is there, yea, that that Body which was born of the Virgin Mary, and that hung upon the Cross, Flesh, Blood, Bones and all is whole in every Point and Crum of the Consecrated Wafer; and there remains nothing of the Consecrated Elements; and that 'tis this their Adoration is paid to. But surely now they had need to have good grounds that this is so; this had need to be wonderfully clear in Scripture; and yet when they come to prove it thereby, they bring these Words, *This is my Body*, and conclude there is foundation enough for all this, and much more; as if there were no figurative expressions in Scripture; and as if there were a necessity to take Scripture in a Sense which contradicts Sense and Reason, when another Sense more natural and easie may be had.

And now to close up all with some good Advice for us Protestants, and that too in Dr. Sherlock's Words, only putting the Word Scripture in lieu of Fathers (a little Alteration, do not stand upon't; come, come, shew a little good nature for once, and take it upon my word) Amongst Christians there is not one in a hundred thousand who understands all Scripture, and it is morally impossible they should,

22 *A Defence of Dr. S's. Preservative, &c.*

Should, and therefore certainly there must be an easier and shorter way to understand Christian Religion than this, or else the generality of Mankind, even of profess'd Christians, are out of a possibility of Salvation: Think well on it, as you will answer at God's Tribunal for the Care you took of the one only necessary, the saving of your Soul; ; seek out that easier and shorter way, and walk faithfully in it. As good, e'en close your Eyes, and examin nothing, but come over to our Mother *Rome*, and be resolute, and I'll warrant an happy Agreement. If this is not to be thorough Papist, and thorough Romish Priest, I know not what is: But to consider it a little, tho the truth is, it doth not deserve it, all Scripture, yes all Scripture must be understood, or else the Christian Religion cannot: So that if a Man understood all the Texts of the old and New Testament, except one, as for Instance, that in the 9th of the Revelations, v. 14. he cannot understand the Christian Religion, and is out of a possibility of Salvation. This is a wonderful Discovery, and yet one would not think it came out of a Jesuit's Forge; 'tis wrote so bunglingly, 'tis not done with Art enough to deceive, and so will not answer the Makers Purpose: For as for us Protestants, I hope we are above such little Shams; and we do not only say, but we find that Scripture in all points necessary to Salvation is plain and easie; so that we may run and read: 'Tis true, there are some Texts, which we that are unlearned, cannot readily find the true Sense and meaning of; but they are not such as immediately concern Salvation; and we are not destitute of Helps as to these; for we have Learned and Religious Divines, whom we have all the reasons imaginable to believe have no other Design upon us, than the *Good of Souls*, to whom we may have recourse; and we always find them willing and ready to afford us their Assistance: So that to conclude, we are very happy where we are, and in a very fair way to understand Scripture, tho it may be not every jot and tittle of it. However, I think it much better to know some, and so much as is sufficient for my Salvation, than to go over to a Church which would have me stupify'd, and to understand none at all.

F I N I S.

